U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Roseburg District, Oregon

Bonanza Commercial Thinning Harvest

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District of the Bureau of Land Management has analyzed a proposal called the **Bonanza Commercial Thinning Harvest**. In the proposed action, commercial thinning harvest and density management of young growth timber would occur in the Calapooya Watershed located in Sections 16, and 17; T24S R3W, W.M.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-04-07, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

1). Approximately 250 acres were analyzed for potential harvest activity (EA, pg. 3) of which activities would occur on 207 acres representing less than 0.1% of the watershed landbase.

2). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 12) or cultural resources (EA, page 12).

3). The actions anticipated under this analysis are covered under the *Formal consultation and written concurrence on FY 2003-2008 management activities (Ref.# 1-15-03-F-160)* (February 21, 2003, Table 1a) with the US Fish & Wildlife Service which concluded (pg. 29) that the project would ". . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl, murrelet and bald eagle, and are not likely to adversely modify spotted owl or murrelet critical habitat . . ." (EA, pg. 27). *The Five-Year Status Review for the Northern Spotted Owl* (USFWS, 2004) was released in November 2004. The final determination of the review was to keep the status of the northern spotted owl as 'threatened'.

4). Since the OC coho salmon is only a candidate for listing, ESA consultation and a Biological Opinion are not required. BLM's Biological Assessment determined the proposed project to be a Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) for the coho. In addition, the proposed activities were analyzed for, and determined to not adversely affect Essential Fisheries Habitat (EFH).

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated *Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan* (RMP) dated June 2, 1995. This proposal is located on lands within the Matrix and Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations. The RMP permits ". . . timber harvest and other silvicultural activities in that portion of the matrix with suitable forest lands, according to management actions/directions . . ." (RMP, pg. 33). The RMP (pg. 25) also permits silvicultural practices within the Riparian Reserves in order to ". . . acquire desired vegetation characteristics needed to attain Aquatic Conservation Strategy [ACS] objectives." This proposal would also help to provide ". . . a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products that will help maintain the stability of local and regional economies . . .” (RMP pg. 3). Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and the proposed action alternative. Full and partial road decommissioning as well as road renovation and improvement would also be accomplished on certain existing roads as part of the proposed action.

Finding of No Significant Impacts:

I have reviewed this Environmental Assessment for any potentially significant environmental impacts. The tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached) were applied. Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared.

_____ _____

Marci L. Todd Date
Swiftwater Field Manager

Summary of Effects of the Proposed Action

Context (What?)	Intensity (How Much?)	Reason for not being Significant
Modification of Northern spotted owl dispersal habitat (EA pg. 17, para. 5).	Disturbance of 207 acres. (Note acreage changed due to reduction of 11 ac. due to special status bat.)	"No spotted owl sites are within 1.2 miles (provincial home range) of the proposed project area" (EA, pg. 14, para. 2). Area "would continue to function as dispersal habitat, but in a slightly degraded condition . . . [but] functionality of the modified dispersal habitat would improve for the spotted owl in 10 to 15 years (EA, pg. 17, para. 5).
Modification of habitat for Bureau Sensitive and Bureau Assessment species (EA, pg. 18, para. 1).	Disturbance of 207 acres.	Only Columbian white-tailed deer and Townsend's big-eared bat are documented within project (EA, pg. 14, para. 3). "Thinning would be a short-term benefit to white-tailed deer by providing . . . increased forb and shrub growth available for forage (EA, pg. 18, para. 1)." NOTE: Fifteen acres were removed from the project to provide protection for the Townsend's big-eared bat (Bureau Assessment Species).
Soil compaction and displacement (EA pg. 18, para. 4).	**Roads** - Recompaction and disturbance on about 0.4 acre of existing trail and road and 0.7 ac. of new compaction and displacement on new construction for 0.5% of project area. **Skyline logging** across 174 ac. and **Ground-based logging** on up to 53 ac. (EA, pg. 5, Table 1). "About 10% of the ground-based area [3-5 ac.]would have moderate to heavy compaction from the past and current entry" (EA, pg. 19, para. 1).	**Roads** - "After subsoiling (Spurs #1, 2 and 3) there would be a slight net loss in long-term soil productivity from natural conditions." **Skyline logging** - "small amounts of light, superficial compaction on less than one percent [1.7 ac.] of the skyline yarded ground." **Ground-based logging** - "area in main skid trails, log decks and landings would not exceed the plan maintenance threshold of 10 percent" (EA, pg. 19, para. 1). Subsoiling "could restore productivity up to about one acre of compacted surface" (EA, pg. 19, para. 1).

Context (What?)	Intensity (How Much?)	Reason for not being Significant
Increase in the probability of harvest-related debris avalanches (EA, pg. 19, para. 2).	11 acres of FGR slopes (5% of project area).	"Probability . . . would still be in the low range (<10 percent) . . . and . . . within the range of natural variation. . . . The likely size of any harvest-related landslide . . . would be small (less than 0.1 acres)."
Increase in stream sedimentation from timber felling, yarding, and hauling (EA pg. 19, para. 3) and . . .	Project area of 207 ac. (EA, pg. 19, Table 1).	"In the absence of harvest-related landslides . . . virtually no sediment would reach streams from thinned stands due to the "no-harvest" buffer acting as a filter strip . . ." (EA pg. 19, para. 5). "In-stream sedimentation from road construction, maintenance of existing roads, and timber haul is not expected to be measurable in streams and would not be above existing background levels [due to incorporation of PDC's]" (EA, pg. 22, para. 2).
Construction of temporary natural surface roads within the Riparian Reserve (EA, pg. 20, para. 1).	Approximately 500 ft of new construction and 400 ft. on old roadbed.	"No adverse impact from the spur road construction would occur because sediment transport would not occur since all sediment would be filtered out when the stream goes subsurface."
Increase in water temperature from stream forest canopy reduction (EA pg. 19, para. 3).	"Stream reaches within Unit 17A . . . [totaling] approximately 6800 feet . . . [and] about 300 feet . . . within the unit in Section 16" (EA, pg. 12, para. 6).	"All streams . . . are seasonal intermittent streams . . . [and] do not contribute to elevated water temperature in Calapooya Creek." "Stream temperature would not be affected by the road in the Riparian Reserve because the stream dries up during the summer months" (EA, pg. 20; para. 2).
Increase in water yield and peak flows due to removal of forest canopy (EA pg. 19, para. 3).	Project area of 207 ac. (EA, pg. 19, Table 1).	"Increases in base flow are . . . not expected because extra available moisture, if any, would likely be consumed by the residual riparian vegetation." "Increases in peak flows . . . are also not expected since large openings would not be created." (EA, pg. 21, para. 1).
Altering amounts of large woody debris within the riparian areas (EA, pg. 19, para. 1).		"The dense stand within the no-harvest buffer would provide adequate coarse woody material in the short-term . . . the long-term impacts would enhance the riparian resources within the project area by providing future large woody debris . . ." (EA, pg. 22, para. 1).

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: No identified impacts are judged to be severe.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design criteria governing the proposal (EA, pg. 17 through 23), the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) do not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics ((EA, Appendix E).

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: No controversial effects were noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.

5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.

6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: The advertisement, auction, and award of a timber sale contract allowing the harvest of trees is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.

8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? ( ) Yes (√) No
   Remarks: The EA (Appendix E) indicates that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species	( ) Yes	(√) No
Botanical Species	( ) Yes	(√) No
Terrestrial Species	( ) Yes	(√) No

Remarks: Biological Assessment determined the proposed project to be a "Not Likely to Adversely Affect" for the coho salmon.

Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required.

This action is covered under the FWS *Formal consultation and written concurrence on FY 2003-2008 management actions* (February 21, 2003) which concluded that activity is ". . . not likely to adversely affect spotted owls and murrelets . . .".

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? ( ) Yes (√) No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.